<center>**REMARKS**</center>

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-23 and 26-29 remain pending in the application. Claim 11 is amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Double Patenting Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-23 and 26-29 under the judiciary created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent 6,643,650. A terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejection has been filed along with this response. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the double patenting rejection of claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-23 and 26-29.

Section 102(e) rejections:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-23 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Humpleman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,546,419) (hereinafter "Humpleman"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

> **I.   Claim 1 is allowable over Humpleman because Humpleman does not disclose each element of claim 1.**

> **A.   Humpleman does not teach "sending a lookup message to a space, wherein the lookup message specifies desired characteristics of documents stored within the space" and "receiving a lookup response indicating identifiers of discovered documents within the space that, in addition to being stored in the space, match the desired characteristics."**

The Office Action cites to col. 15, lines 2-8 and col. 23, lines 32-34 of Humpleman as teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the cited passages, nor any other part of Humpleman of which Applicants are aware, teaches the

recited "lookup response indicating identifiers of discovered documents." Whereas claim 1 recites "receiving a lookup response indicating <u>identifiers</u> of discovered <u>documents</u>" *in plural*, Humpleman treats the "an identifier" in singular. Specifically, col. 15, lines 2-8 of Humpleman states that:

> In a first example, the application E accesses the application interface description A by remote query over the network. In a second example, the application E accesses the application interface description A by transferring a copy of the application interface description A from the controlled device 14 to the controller device 14. The application E then queries the interface description A locally. In a third example, the application interface description A is transferred to a library device 64 which provides library space for interface descriptions, and the application E remotely queries the interface description A in the library. The library device 64 stored the address (URI) of the associated applications available for direct control action and responses.

Humpleman at col. 14, line 63- col. 15, line 8. The quoted text of Humpleman exclusively refers to the interface description <u>in singular</u>. Col. 23, lines 32-34 of Humpleman do not contradict this emphasis on the interface description in singular in col. 15, merely instead stating "Referenced above, `service_id` or `application_interface_id` includes the name, address or Web address or URL location of one or more devices 14." Applicants recite identifie<u>r</u>s, plural, in a lookup message. Humpleman teaches only a single identifier in the passages cited by the Office Action. The Office Action has cited col. 23, lines 49-51 for the recited lookup message, and the cited section of Humpleman states that "Thereafter, a user can search for <u>a</u> service in the database and access <u>an</u> application whose interface includes <u>a</u> particular data branch of the library using <u>said</u> name/address. As such, the network can include multiple identical services distinguished by said name/address information." (<u>emphasis</u> supplied). Rather than allowing a lookup message to specify desired characteristics, and the response identify <u>multiple</u> matching documents, as recited, Humpleman instead appears to support a lookup message applying only a unique characteristic (name/address) and supplying a single response. Where searches by media type are disclosed at col. 23, lines 57-79, those searches appear to be pointed to the XCE database, which 104, which is separate from the interface library 106 and plays no role in the answering of a lookup message.

See FIG. 20 and col. 19, line 48- col. 20, line 3.

Humpleman's architecture relies on a highly deterministic system of nomenclature that supports lookup messages for and responses of <u>a single identity</u> and therefore specifically does not identify multiple matching documents in a specific response. In fact, Humpleman's deterministic lookup that relies on a unique name/address is explicitly counter to returning an indication of multiple matching documents in response to a single lookup. Thus, Humpleman explicitly does not and can not disclose every element recited in Applicants' claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Humpleman does not anticipate claim 1.

B. Independent claims 11 and 21 are likewise allowable.

Independent claims 11 and 21 recite limitations similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1, and were rejected using similar reasoning. Therefore, the arguments presented above apply similarly to these claims. Further, independent claim 21 now recites that the lookup message and characteristics are in the same markup language as the service advertisements and the message sent by the client to the service. These aspects of claim 21 are not taught by Humpleman. Applicants therefore respectfully request the removal of the rejection of claims 1, 11 and 21 and all claims depending therefrom. Applicants further request an indication of the allowability of all currently pending claims.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 10, 20 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Zintel, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,725,281) (hereinafter "Zintel"). This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given above. Zintel does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Humpleman in regard to Applicants' independent claims.

Applicants also assert that numerous other ones of the dependent claims, including claims 10, 20 and 30, recite further distinctions over the cited art. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-64900/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: ___June 13, 2011___